Remarks

The Office Action mailed June 13, 2005, and made final, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in consequence thereof.

Claims 1-15 are now pending in this application. Claims 1-15 stand rejected.

The rejection of Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,499,227 (Jacobson) in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0084495 A1 (Rudeen) or U.S. Patent No. 5,934,530 (Antczak) is respectfully traversed.

Jacobson describes an accessory 10 that attaches to a golf cart 15 via a securing strap 35 that is wrapped around a pole 20 of golf cart 15. Specifically, a second end 32 of securing strap 35 wraps around pole 20 and is pulled through a latch 70 to secure strap 35 against pole 20. A first end 34 of securing strap 35 extends a distance outwardly from pole 20 and away from golf cart 15. A card 40 is coupled to and suspended from the portion of securing strap 35 extending outwardly from pole 20. Card 40 includes a glove attachment device 50 for securing the glove thereto to facilitate drying the glove.

Rudeen describes a carrier device 100 for transporting a golfer's accessories during play. Carrier device 100 includes a carrier member 200 attached to a glove attachment surface 210 that is configured to engage a portion of a golf glove such that the golf glove can be stored on carrier member 200 when not being used by the golfer. In one embodiment, carrier member 200 is configured to secure one or more golf balls therein. In another embodiment, various device holders 206, 208, 214, 216, 218, and 220 are attached to carrier member 200.

Antczak describes a golf accessory organizer allowing a golfer to comfortably carry and easily access items such as tees 59, golf balls 51, golf-gloves 53, divot tools 57, ball markers 55, personal items or other small-type golfing accessories while playing a round of golf. A main supporting member 1 of the device is primarily manufacturing from injection-molded plastic. Integral in supporting member 1 are tee holders 5, 7, 9, and 11, a ball marker

holder 3, and a pouch 41 for holding golf balls 51 may pivotally hang from supporting member 1. Alternatively, a golf ball 51 is retained in a pressure clip 87 hinged to supporting member 1. Supporting member 1 may have an area 19 and 21 covered with a hook or loop material for holding various small items such as a divot tool 57, golf glove 53, or sunglasses.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-15 is not a proper rejection. As is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. None of Jacobson, Rudeen, or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the claimed combination. Furthermore, in contrast to the assertion within the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Jacobson with Rudeen or Antczak, because there is no motivation to combine the references suggested in the art. Additionally, the Examiner has not pointed to any prior art that teaches or suggests to combine the disclosures, other than Applicant's own teaching.

As the Federal Circuit has recognized, obviousness is not established merely by combining references having different individual elements of pending claims. Ex parte Levengood, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). MPEP 2143.01. Rather, there must be some suggestion, outside of Applicants' disclosure, in the prior art to combine such references, and a reasonable expectation of success must be both found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck , 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the present case, neither a suggestion or motivation to combine the prior art disclosures, nor any reasonable expectation of success has been shown.

Furthermore, it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the cited art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. Specifically, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the art to deprecate the claimed invention. Further, it is impermissible to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such

reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. The present Section 103 rejection is clearly based on a combination of teachings selected from multiple patents in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention.

Moreover, if art "teaches away" from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the nonobviousness of the invention. U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In light of this standard, it is respectfully submitted that the cited, as a whole, is not suggestive of the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Moreover, to the extent understood, no combination of Jacobson, Rudeen, or Antczak describes or suggests the claimed combination and as such, the presently pending claims are patentably distinguishable from the cited combination. Specifically, Claim 1 recites a golf cart that includes "at least one external surface...an apparatus for coupling a glove to said at least one external surface, said apparatus comprising a body comprising an inner surface and an opposite outer surface that extends between a first end and an opposite second end, said body being a flexible sheet material coupled to said golf cart such that said body conforms to a shape of said at least one external surface, said inner surface remains in substantial contact against said at least one external surface during operation of said golf cart, and said inners surface is substantially concentrically aligned with said at least one external surface, said body outer surface comprising at least one fastening mechanism for removably coupling a glove to said body such that the glove remains coupled to said apparatus during operation of said golf cart."

None of Jacobson, Rudeen, or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the golf cart recited in Claim 1. For example, none of Jacobson, Rudeen or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a golf cart including an apparatus including a body having an inner surface and an opposite outer surface, wherein the body is a flexible sheet material coupled to the golf cart such that the body conforms to a shape of at least one external surface of the golf cart and the inner surface remains in

substantial contact against the at least one external surface. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Jacobson describes an accessory that attaches to a golf cart via an end securing strap, such that an opposite end of the strap is positioned a distance outwardly from the golf cart. As such, the apparatus described in Jacobson does not include an inner surface that remains in substantial contact against an external surface of the golf cart between a first end and a second end of the apparatus. Neither Rudeen nor Antczak make up for the deficiencies of Jacobson. Rather, Rudeen describes a golf accessory carrier that attaches to a golfer's belt or pants; and Antczak describes a golf accessory organizer that attaches to a golfer's belt or waistband.

Moreover, there is no motivation or suggestion within Rudeen, Antczak, or Jacobson to substitute the securing strap of Jacobson with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak, as suggested on page 2 of the Final Office Action. For example, the carrier of Rudeen and the organizer of Antczak are sized and shaped to attach to a golfer's belt or waistband, and attach thereto using a clip. In contrast, the accessory described in Jacobson is sized and shaped to attach to a golf cart pole, and attaches thereto using a securing strap. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not be motivated from Rudeen, Antczak, or Jacobson to substitute the securing strap of Jacobson with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Jacobson in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claims 2-6 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-6 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 2-6 likewise are patentable over Jacobson in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claim 7 recites a golf cart that includes "a passenger compartment...at least one frame support adjacent to said passenger compartment...a dashboard adjacent to said passenger compartment...a roof extending over at least a portion of said passenger compartment...a glove drying system coupled to an external surface of at least one of said

passenger compartment, said at least one frame support, said dashboard, and said roof, said golf drying system comprising a first end, a second end, and a body extending therebetween, said body being a flexible sheet material comprising an inner surface and an opposite outer surface, said body coupled to said golf cart such that said body conforms to a shape of said golf cart external surface, substantially all of said inner surface remains against said golf cart external surface during operation of said golf cart, and said inner surface is substantially concentrically aligned with the external surface, said body outer surface comprises at least one fastening mechanism for removably coupling a glove to said system such that the glove remains coupled to said fastening mechanism between said first end and said second end during operation of said golf cart."

None of Jacobson, Rudeen, or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the golf cart recited in Claim 7. For example, none of Jacobson, Rudeen or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a golf cart including a glove drying system including a first end, a second end, and a body extending therebetween that is a flexible sheet material and includes an inner surface and an opposite outer surface, wherein the body is coupled to the golf cart such that the body conforms to a shape of a golf cart external surface and substantially all of the inner surface remains against a golf cart external surface. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Jacobson describes an accessory that attaches to a golf cart via an end securing strap, such that an opposite end of the strap is positioned a distance outwardly from the golf cart. As such, the apparatus described in Jacobson does not include an inner surface that remains in substantial contact against an external surface of the golf cart between a first end and a second end of the apparatus. Neither Rudeen nor Antczak make up for the deficiencies of Jacobson. Rather, Rudeen describes a golf accessory carrier that attaches to a golfer's belt or pants; and Antczak describes a golf accessory organizer that attaches to a golfer's belt or waistband.

Moreover, there is no motivation or suggestion within Rudeen, Antczak, or Jacobson to substitute the securing strap of Jacobson with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak, as suggested on page 2 of the Final Office Action. For example, the carrier of Rudeen and the organizer of Antczak are sized and shaped to attach to a golfer's belt or

waistband, and attach thereto using a clip. In contrast, the accessory described in Jacobson is sized and shaped to attach to a golf cart pole, and attaches thereto using a securing strap. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not be motivated from Rudeen, Antczak, or Jacobson to substitute the securing strap of Jacobson with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 7 is submitted to be patentable over Jacobson in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claims 8-12 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 7. When the recitations of Claims 8-12 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 7, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 8-12 likewise are patentable over Jacobson in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claim 13 recites a method of drying a damp golf glove, wherein the method includes "providing a golf glove drying system that includes a body having an inner surface and an opposite outer surface and being a flexible sheet material such that each surface extends between a first end and an opposite second end...coupling the golf glove drying system to the golf cart such that the body conforms to a shape of at least one external surface of the golf cart, substantially all of the body inner surface between the first end and the second end remains in contact with the external surface of the golf cart during operation of the golf cart, and the inner surface is substantially concentrically aligned with the external surface of the golf cart...and removably coupling a golf glove to the golf cart using at least one fastening mechanism extending from the body outer surface, such that the golf glove remains suspended from the golf glove drying system between the first end and the second end during operation of the golf cart."

None of Jacobson, Rudeen, or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the method recited in Claim 13. For example, none of Jacobson, Rudeen or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest coupling a golf glove drying system to a golf cart such that a body conforms to a shape of at least one external

surface of the golf cart and substantially all of a body inner surface remains in contact with an external surface of the golf cart. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Jacobson describes an accessory that attaches to a golf cart via an end securing strap, such that an opposite end of the strap is positioned a distance outwardly from the golf cart. As such, the apparatus described in Jacobson does not include an inner surface that remains in substantial contact against an external surface of the golf cart between a first end and a second end of the apparatus. Neither Rudeen nor Antczak make up for the deficiencies of Jacobson. Rather, Rudeen describes a golf accessory carrier that attaches to a golfer's belt or pants; and Antczak describes a golf accessory organizer that attaches to a golfer's belt or waistband.

Moreover, there is no motivation or suggestion within Rudeen, Antczak, or Jacobson to substitute the securing strap of Jacobson with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak, as suggested on page 2 of the Final Office Action. For example, the carrier of Rudeen and the organizer of Antczak are sized and shaped to attach to a golfer's belt or waistband, and attach thereto using a clip. In contrast, the accessory described in Jacobson is sized and shaped to attach to a golf cart pole, and attaches thereto using a securing strap. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not be motivated from Rudeen, Antczak, or Jacobson to substitute the securing strap of Jacobson with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak.

Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 13 is submitted to be patentable over Jacobson in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claims 14-15 depend from independent Claim 13. When the recitations of Claims 14-15 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 13, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 14-15 likewise are patentable over Jacobson in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-15 as being unpatentable over Jacobson in view of Rudeen or Antczak be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,983,518 (Ellenburg) in view of Rudeen or Antczak is respectfully traversed.

Ellenburg describes a golf glove dryer 10 that attaches to a golf cart. Golf glove dryer 10 includes a hollow shell 12 having a first open end 14 and a second open end 16. First end 14 attaches to a shaft 19 that extends outwardly from a clamp 20 for a distance. Clamp is coupled to a roof support 32 of the golf cart such that hollow shell 12 is positioned exterior to the golf cart. Glove 36 is positioned over second end 16 and glove wrist fastener 38 is secured to glove wrist portion 40 thereby securing glove around hollow shell 12. Cross members 18 hold glove 36 in an open position, allowing air flow through hollow shell 12 into glove 36.

Rudeen and Antczak are described above.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-15 is not a proper rejection. As is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. None of Ellenburg, Rudeen, or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the claimed combination. Furthermore, in contrast to the assertion within the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Ellenburg with Rudeen or Antczak, because there is no motivation to combine the references suggested in the art. Additionally, the Examiner has not pointed to any prior art that teaches or suggests to combine the disclosures, other than Applicant's own teaching.

As the Federal Circuit has recognized, obviousness is not established merely by combining references having different individual elements of pending claims. Ex parte Levengood, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). MPEP 2143.01. Rather, there must be some suggestion, outside of Applicants' disclosure, in the prior art to combine such references, and a reasonable expectation of success must be both found in the prior art,

and not based on Applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck , 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the present case, neither a suggestion or motivation to combine the prior art disclosures, nor any reasonable expectation of success has been shown.

Furthermore, it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the cited art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. Specifically, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the art to deprecate the claimed invention. Further, it is impermissible to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. The present Section 103 rejection is clearly based on a combination of teachings selected from multiple patents in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention.

Moreover, if art "teaches away" from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the nonobviousness of the invention. U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In light of this standard, it is respectfully submitted that the cited, as a whole, is not suggestive of the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Moreover, to the extent understood, no combination of Ellenburg, Rudeen, or Antczak describes or suggests the claimed combination and as such, the presently pending claims are patentably distinguishable from the cited combination. Specifically, Claim 1 recites a golf cart that includes "at least one external surface...an apparatus for coupling a glove to said at least one external surface, said apparatus comprising a body comprising an inner surface and an opposite outer surface that extends between a first end and an opposite second end, said body being a flexible sheet material coupled to said golf cart such that said body conforms to a shape of said at least one external surface, said inner surface remains in substantial contact against said at least one external surface during operation of said golf cart, and said inners surface is substantially concentrically aligned with said at least one external surface, said

body outer surface comprising at least one fastening mechanism for removably coupling a glove to said body such that the glove remains coupled to said apparatus during operation of said golf cart."

None of Ellenburg, Rudeen, or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the golf cart recited in Claim 1. For example, none of Ellenburg, Rudeen or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a golf cart including an apparatus including a body that is a flexible sheet material and is coupled to the golf cart such that the body conforms to a shape of at least one external surface of the gold cart. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Ellenburg describes a golf glove dryer that attaches to a golf cart via a clamp. Neither Rudeen nor Antczak make up for the deficiencies of Ellenburg. Rather, Rudeen describes a golf accessory carrier that attaches to a golfer's belt or pants; and Antczak describes a golf accessory organizer that attaches to a golfer's belt or waistband.

Moreover, there is no motivation or suggestion within Rudeen, Antczak, or Ellenburg to substitute the golf glove dryer of Ellenburg with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak, as suggested on page 3 of the Final Office Action. For example, the carrier of Rudeen and the organizer of Antczak are sized and shaped to attach to a golfer's belt or waistband, and attach thereto using a clip. In contrast, the dryer described in Ellenburg is sized and shaped to attach to a golf cart roof support, and attaches thereto using a clamp. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not be motivated from Rudeen, Antczak, or Ellenburg to substitute the dryer of Ellenburg with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Ellenburg in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claims 2-6 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-6 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 2-6 likewise are patentable over Ellenburg in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claim 7 recites a golf cart that includes "a passenger compartment...at least one frame support adjacent to said passenger compartment...a dashboard adjacent to said passenger compartment...a roof extending over at least a portion of said passenger compartment...a glove drying system coupled to an external surface of at least one of said passenger compartment, said at least one frame support, said dashboard, and said roof, said golf drying system comprising a first end, a second end, and a body extending therebetween, said body being a flexible sheet material comprising an inner surface and an opposite outer surface, said body coupled to said golf cart such that said body conforms to a shape of said golf cart external surface, substantially all of said inner surface remains against said golf cart external surface during operation of said golf cart, and said inner surface is substantially concentrically aligned with the external surface, said body outer surface comprises at least one fastening mechanism for removably coupling a glove to said system such that the glove remains coupled to said fastening mechanism between said first end and said second end during operation of said golf cart."

None of Ellenburg, Rudeen, or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the golf cart recited in Claim 7. For example, none of Ellenburg, Rudeen or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a golf cart including a glove drying system including a first end, a second end, and a body extending therebetween that is a flexible sheet material and is coupled to the golf cart such that the body conforms to a shape of an external surface of the golf cart. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Ellenburg describes a golf glove dryer that attaches to a golf cart via a clamp. Neither Rudeen nor Antczak make up for the deficiencies of Ellenburg. Rather, Rudeen describes a golf accessory carrier that attaches to a golfer's belt or pants; and Antczak describes a golf accessory organizer that attaches to a golfer's belt or waistband.

Moreover, there is no motivation or suggestion within Rudeen, Antczak, or Ellenburg to substitute the golf glove dryer of Ellenburg with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak, as suggested on page 3 of the Final Office Action. For example, the carrier of Rudeen and the organizer of Antczak are sized and shaped to attach to a golfer's belt or waistband, and attach thereto using a clip. In contrast, the dryer described in Ellenburg is

sized and shaped to attach to a golf cart roof support, and attaches thereto using a clamp. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not be motivated from Rudeen, Antczak, or Ellenburg to substitute the dryer of Ellenburg with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 7 is submitted to be patentable over Ellenburg in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claims 8-12 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 7. When the recitations of Claims 8-12 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 7, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 8-12 likewise are patentable over Ellenburg in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claim 13 recites a method of drying a damp golf glove, wherein the method includes "providing a golf glove drying system that includes a body having an inner surface and an opposite outer surface and being a flexible sheet material such that each surface extends between a first end and an opposite second end...coupling the golf glove drying system to the golf cart such that the body conforms to a shape of at least one external surface of the golf cart, substantially all of the body inner surface between the first end and the second end remains in contact with the external surface of the golf cart during operation of the golf cart, and the inner surface is substantially concentrically aligned with the external surface of the golf cart...and removably coupling a golf glove to the golf cart using at least one fastening mechanism extending from the body outer surface, such that the golf glove remains suspended from the golf glove drying system between the first end and the second end during operation of the golf cart."

None of Ellenburg, Rudeen, or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the method recited in Claim 13. For example, none of Ellenburg, Rudeen or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest providing a golf glove drying system that includes a body being a flexible sheet material, and coupling the golf glove drying system to a golf cart such that the body conforms to a shape of an external

surface of the golf cart. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Ellenburg describes a golf glove dryer that attaches to a golf cart via a clamp. Neither Rudeen nor Antczak make up for the deficiencies of Ellenburg. Rather, Rudeen describes a golf accessory carrier that attaches to a golfer's belt or pants; and Antczak describes a golf accessory organizer that attaches to a golfer's belt or waistband.

Moreover, there is no motivation or suggestion within Rudeen, Antczak, or Ellenburg to substitute the golf glove dryer of Ellenburg with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak, as suggested on page 3 of the Final Office Action. For example, the carrier of Rudeen and the organizer of Antczak are sized and shaped to attach to a golfer's belt or waistband, and attach thereto using a clip. In contrast, the dryer described in Ellenburg is sized and shaped to attach to a golf cart roof support, and attaches thereto using a clamp. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not be motivated from Rudeen, Antczak, or Ellenburg to substitute the dryer of Ellenburg with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak.

For the reasons set forth above, Claim 13 is submitted to be patentable over Ellenburg in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claims 14-15 depend from independent Claim 13. When the recitations of Claims 14-15 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 13, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 14-15 likewise are patentable over Ellenburg in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-15 as being unpatentable over Ellenburg in view of Rudeen or Antczak be withdrawn.

The rejection of Claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication No. 2002/0138953 (Passafiume) in view of Rudeen or Antczak is respectfully traversed.

Passafiume describes a golf glove holder 10 adapted to be mounted to a golf cart frame member 12. Golf glove holder 10 includes a main body 30 and an attachment member 50 affixed to main body 30 for attachment of golf glove holder 10 to golf cart body frame member 12. Main body 30 of golf glove holder 10 is preferably cylindrical and includes a golf glove holder at one end of main body 30. The golf glove holder is configured to releasably hold an interior wrist sweat band of a golf glove 20 along at least a portion of an outer circumference of main body 30 such that air flowing through main body 30 is directed into glove 20. Preferably, the golf glove holder comprises a strip 32 of nylon hook material adhesively affixed to an outer circumference of one end of main body 30. Strip 32 is adapted to releasably hold the golf glove wrist sweat band. Main body 30 is preferably a length of PVC plastic pipe having a outer diameter of 23/8 inches and a length of 21/2 inches. Attachment member 50 is affixed to main body 30 and includes a clamp portion 52 for attachment to frame member 12. Preferably clamp portion 52 is C-shaped in cross section with flexible extending arms 56 and 58 adapted to wrap around a portion of frame member 12. An adjustable strap 64 extends between arms 56 and 58 to force the arms against frame member 12 thereby securing golf glove holder 10 to frame member 12.

Rudeen and Antczak are described above.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-15 is not a proper rejection. As is well established, obviousness cannot be established by combining the teachings of the cited art to produce the claimed invention, absent some teaching, suggestion, or incentive supporting the combination. None of Passafiume, Rudeen, or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the claimed combination. Furthermore, in contrast to the assertion within the Office Action, Applicant respectfully submits that it would not be obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Passafiume with Rudeen or Antczak, because there is no motivation to combine the references suggested in the art. Additionally, the Examiner has not pointed to any prior art that teaches or suggests to combine the disclosures, other than Applicant's own teaching.

As the Federal Circuit has recognized, obviousness is not established merely by combining references having different individual elements of pending claims. Ex parte Levengood, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1300 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1993). MPEP 2143.01. Rather, there must be some suggestion, outside of Applicants' disclosure, in the prior art to combine such references, and a reasonable expectation of success must be both found in the prior art, and not based on Applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck , 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1436 (Fed. Cir. 1991). In the present case, neither a suggestion or motivation to combine the prior art disclosures, nor any reasonable expectation of success has been shown.

Furthermore, it is impermissible to use the claimed invention as an instruction manual or "template" to piece together the teachings of the cited art so that the claimed invention is rendered obvious. Specifically, one cannot use hindsight reconstruction to pick and choose among isolated disclosures in the art to deprecate the claimed invention. Further, it is impermissible to pick and choose from any one reference only so much of it as will support a given position, to the exclusion of other parts necessary to the full appreciation of what such reference fairly suggests to one of ordinary skill in the art. The present Section 103 rejection is clearly based on a combination of teachings selected from multiple patents in an attempt to arrive at the claimed invention.

Moreover, if art "teaches away" from a claimed invention, such a teaching supports the nonobviousness of the invention. U.S. v. Adams, 148 USPQ 479 (1966); Gillette Co. v. S.C. Johnson & Son, Inc., 16 USPQ2d 1923, 1927 (Fed. Cir. 1990). In light of this standard, it is respectfully submitted that the cited, as a whole, is not suggestive of the presently claimed invention. Accordingly, for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully request that the Section 103 rejection be withdrawn.

Moreover, to the extent understood, no combination of Passafiume, Rudeen, or Antczak describes or suggests the claimed combination and as such, the presently pending claims are patentably distinguishable from the cited combination. Specifically, Claim 1 recites a golf cart that includes "at least one external surface...an apparatus for coupling a glove to said at least one external surface, said apparatus comprising a body comprising an

inner surface and an opposite outer surface that extends between a first end and an opposite second end, said body being a flexible sheet material coupled to said golf cart such that said body conforms to a shape of said at least one external surface, said inner surface remains in substantial contact against said at least one external surface during operation of said golf cart, and said inners surface is substantially concentrically aligned with said at least one external surface, said body outer surface comprising at least one fastening mechanism for removably coupling a glove to said body such that the glove remains coupled to said apparatus during operation of said golf cart."

None of Passafiume, Rudeen, or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the golf cart recited in Claim 1. For example, none of Passafiume, Rudeen or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a golf cart including an apparatus including a body having an inner surface and an opposite outer surface, wherein the body is a flexible sheet material coupled to the golf cart such that the body conforms to a shape of the at least one external surface. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Passafiume describes a golf glove holder that attaches to a frame member of a golf cart using a clamp. Neither Rudeen nor Antczak make up for the deficiencies of Passafiume. Rather, Rudeen describes a golf accessory carrier that attaches to a golfer's belt or pants; and Antczak describes a golf accessory organizer that attaches to a golfer's belt or waistband.

Moreover, there is no motivation or suggestion within Rudeen, Antczak, or Passafiume to substitute the golf glove holder of Passafiume with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak, as suggested on page 4 of the Final Office Action. For example, the carrier of Rudeen and the organizer of Antczak are sized and shaped to attach to a golfer's belt or waistband, and attach thereto using a clip. In contrast, the holder described in Passafiume is sized and shaped to attach to a golf cart frame member, and attaches thereto using a clamp. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not be motivated from Rudeen, Antczak, or Passafiume to substitute the holder of Passafiume with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 1 is submitted to be patentable over Passafiume in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claims 2-6 depend from independent Claim 1. When the recitations of Claims 2-6 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 1, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 2-6 likewise are patentable over Passafiume in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claim 7 recites a golf cart that includes "a passenger compartment...at least one frame support adjacent to said passenger compartment...a dashboard adjacent to said passenger compartment...a roof extending over at least a portion of said passenger compartment...a glove drying system coupled to an external surface of at least one of said passenger compartment, said at least one frame support, said dashboard, and said roof, said golf drying system comprising a first end, a second end; and a body extending therebetween, said body being a flexible sheet material comprising an inner surface and an opposite outer surface, said body coupled to said golf cart such that said body conforms to a shape of said golf cart external surface, substantially all of said inner surface remains against said golf cart external surface during operation of said golf cart, and said inner surface is substantially concentrically aligned with the external surface, said body outer surface comprises at least one fastening mechanism for removably coupling a glove to said system such that the glove remains coupled to said fastening mechanism between said first end and said second end during operation of said golf cart."

None of Passafiume, Rudeen, or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the golf cart recited in Claim 7. For example, none of Passafiume, Rudeen or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest a golf cart including a glove drying system including a first end, a second end, and a body extending therebetween that is a flexible sheet material and is coupled to the golf cart such that the body conforms to a shape of a golf cart external surface. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Passafiume describes a golf glove holder that attaches to a frame member of a golf cart using a clamp. Neither Rudeen nor Antczak make up for the deficiencies of Passafiume.

Rather, Rudeen describes a golf accessory carrier that attaches to a golfer's belt or pants; and Antczak describes a golf accessory organizer that attaches to a golfer's belt or waistband.

Moreover, there is no motivation or suggestion within Rudeen, Antczak, or Passafiume to substitute the golf glove holder of Passafiume with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak, as suggested on page 4 of the Final Office Action. For example, the carrier of Rudeen and the organizer of Antczak are sized and shaped to attach to a golfer's belt or waistband, and attach thereto using a clip. In contrast, the holder described in Passafiume is sized and shaped to attach to a golf cart frame member, and attaches thereto using a clamp. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not be motivated from Rudeen, Antczak, or Passafiume to substitute the holder of Passafiume with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Claim 7 is submitted to be patentable over Passafiume in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claims 8-12 depend, directly or indirectly, from independent Claim 7. When the recitations of Claims 8-12 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 7, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 8-12 likewise are patentable over Passafiume in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claim 13 recites a method of drying a damp golf glove, wherein the method includes "providing a golf glove drying system that includes a body having an inner surface and an opposite outer surface and being a flexible sheet material such that each surface extends between a first end and an opposite second end...coupling the golf glove drying system to the golf cart such that the body conforms to a shape of at least one external surface of the golf cart, substantially all of the body inner surface between the first end and the second end remains in contact with the external surface of the golf cart during operation of the golf cart, and the inner surface is substantially concentrically aligned with the external surface of the golf cart...and removably coupling a golf glove to the golf cart using at least one fastening mechanism extending from the body outer surface, such that the golf glove remains

suspended from the golf glove drying system between the first end and the second end during operation of the golf cart."

None of Passafiume, Rudeen, or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest the method recited in Claim 13. For example, none of Passafiume, Rudeen or Antczak, considered alone or in combination, describe or suggest providing a golf glove drying system that includes a body being a flexible sheet material, and coupling the golf glove drying system to a golf cart such that the body conforms to a shape of an external surface of the golf cart. Rather, in contrast to the present invention, Passafiume describes a golf glove holder attaches to a frame member of a golf cart using a clamp. Neither Rudeen nor Antczak make up for the deficiencies of Passafiume. Rather, Rudeen describes a golf accessory carrier that attaches to a golfer's belt or pants; and Antczak describes a golf accessory organizer that attaches to a golfer's belt or waistband.

Moreover, there is no motivation or suggestion within Rudeen, Antczak, or Passafiume to substitute the golf glove holder of Passafiume with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak, as suggested on page 4 of the Final Office Action. For example, the carrier of Rudeen and the organizer of Antczak are sized and shaped to attach to a golfer's belt or waistband, and attach thereto using a clip. In contrast, the holder described in Passafiume is sized and shaped to attach to a golf cart frame member, and attaches thereto using a clamp. Accordingly, one skilled in the art would not be motivated from Rudeen, Antczak, or Passafiume to substitute the holder of Passafiume with the carrier of Rudeen or the organizer of Antczak.

For the reasons set forth above, Claim 13 is submitted to be patentable over Passafiume in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

Claims 14-15 depend from independent Claim 13. When the recitations of Claims 14-15 are considered in combination with the recitations of Claim 13, Applicant submits that dependent Claims 14-15 likewise are patentable over Passafiume in view of Rudeen or Antczak.

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully requests that the Section 103 rejection of Claims 1-15 as being unpatentable over Passafiume in view of Rudeen or Antczak be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, all the claims now active in this application are believed to be in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,



Robert B. Reeser, III
Registration No. 45,548
ARMSTRONG TEASDALE LLP
One Metropolitan Square, Suite 2600
St. Louis, Missouri 63102-2740
(314) 621-5070